DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 336 SP 002 186

By-Haubrich, Vernon

Design and Default in Teacher Education. Occasional Paper Two, NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; Ball State Univ., Muncie, Ind.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Mar 68
Note-27p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.45
Descriptors-Administrative Personnel, *Bureaucracy, College School Cooperation, Cooperative Programs, Educational History, Educational Needs, Higher Education, *Organizational Change, Professional Personnel, *Program Design, *Program Development, Retraining, School Organization, Staff Utilization, *Teacher Education, Teacher Role

Any attempt to change teacher education must recognize the bureaucratic nature of our educational system, a de facto national system with the graduate school as the capstone of an interlocking hierarchy in which power is centered on the middle level functionaries. Role definition and specialization of purpose tend to place the teacher in the role of lower level functionary rather than autonomous professional. Principles of organizational change indicate that to produce change in such a system would require the linking of functionaries, the provision for communication between those at the top and at the bottom, the engaging in programatic activities which are centered in the situation where the functionaries are at work, and the selection of school systems and individuals who seem to have a propensity for testing out new ideas. If schools are to be related to the educational development of children and are to serve other than a gatekeeper or bureaucratic function, priority should be given to (1) programs which design a closer meshing of university and school personnel in a situational context, (2) emphasis on the education and reeducation of administrators, supervisors, and long-term professionals who are in control of the school systems, (3) program development which looks to vertical contexts in professional development, and (4) diagnosis of school difficulties, both teaching and administrative, as the beginning point of courses, with field experiences viewed as mandatory. (JS)

ED026336

THE NDEA NATIONAL INSTITUTE
for advanced study in teaching disadvantaged youth

OCCASIONAL PAPER/TWO
March, 1968

1126 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W. ■ WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DESIGN AND DEFAULT IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Vernon Haubrich

Member,
Institute Steering Committee
and Task Force
Professor,
Educational Policy Studies
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

A Project supported by the Office of Education
administered by The American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education in cooperation with
Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana

SP002 187

The organizational pattern of schooling which prepares most teachers is commonly referred to in the literature as "teacher education." In effect, the teacher education program comprises the sequence of courses and experiences which direct and enable a person to become certified as a teacher in one or more states. The historical, political, social, and psychological components of teacher education form the crux of its support, the mainstay of its program, and the heart of any analysis of the issues involved.

Any consideration of the state

Vernon Haubrich, professor of educational policy studies at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, is senior researcher at the University's Institute for Research on Poverty. He has done research on the education of American Indians, on education in Harlem, and is presently engaged in a five-year study of the effects of desegregation in schools having de jure and de facto segregation. He serves as editorial adviser to the Triple T Project of the USOE, and is a member of the board of the Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs (CONPASS).

of teacher education should look to the components which have constituted it and presently do constitute it. What we shall consider here will be a brief review of the history of the matter, a look at the system of education and the bureaucratic cost it has assumed, the nature of organizational systems and change within systems, the intellectual and emotional gulf between higher and lower education, and finally, a tentative estimate of the directions and priorities which teacher educators may wish to discuss and review.

The Design of Teacher Education
A Historical Perspective

The development of teacher education over the past 80 years has been marked by numerous experiments, ad hoc arrangements, and political compromises. The incredibly-growing need for more and more teachers has dominated the organizational, educational, and professional dimensions of teacher education. Limited enrollments in traditional liberal arts colleges as well as their disaffection with separate teacher education programs, the needs of a developing west, and the population's growing appetite for years of schooling[1]--all these historical factors converged to create that most unique of teacher training institutions--The American normal school.

Serving the needs of many aspiring teachers, this one- or two-year institution developed as its core idea superb management and craftmanship in teaching. This carefully protected tradition of the normal school, while giving the practitioner his due, set the stage, in direct fashion, for the debate as to the "best" kind of education for teachers. There are still four states which allow certification of teachers at the

elementary level with only two years of preparation,[2] but the trend is clearly towards a greater number of years of preparation as well as towards preparation within large multi-purpose institutions.

Another major historical and institutional influence on the education of teachers was the rise of scientism in the college and university. The German model of graduate education, its emphasis on published research findings and its accounting system for promotion and tenure, appeared as typical constraints under which professors worked and administrators judged. Higher education's resulting drive for expansion, ordered to include research, development, teaching, and service within the broad definition of multiversity, was not to be deterred when the issue of teacher education came up. Simply stated, the arrangement evolved whereby students in the teacher education programs would take most of their work in the liberal arts; reciprocally, this increase in departmental rosters would build liberal arts faculty size and power. The bargain was struck; teacher education moved into the bed of the modern university.

Then, inevitably, the issue of standards, quality, and professionalism was raised--directly to the schools and colleges of education, indirectly to the liberal arts and to the graduate schools. With the dominance in the standards movement of accreditation and licensure, the third element of the modern teacher education program came into being--the State Department of Public Instruction, commissioned by the public legislatures to certify, as part of its task, the competency of teachers from kindergarten through high school. For good or for ill, the questions of credit counting, hours in various areas of study, number of hours in practice teaching--all became the concern and popular sport of the bureaucrats, professional associations, public spirited

citizens, college faculties, and national conventions. These competing influences so effectively screened the real issues that rarely was competency in practice ever related to valid and reliable standards. The rule of the market place was dominant; in many instances, Gresham's Law seemed to operate not only after the first few years of teaching, but in the selection process as well.

The evolution of the normal school, from a two-year institution, into a state college, to its final linkage with the form (if not the substance) of a modern university, is a well-documented story in the history of teacher education.[3] Within this development is the genesis of many of the problems one faces in attempting to control, change, or even understand the education of teachers. During the past half century, political and educational negotiations have emphasized local, transitory types of arrangements peculiar to sections of the nation, to the abilities and competencies within states, and to the inclinations of faculty members, administrators, and state department officials. These direct and indirect negotiations have been carried on in local, state, and, presently, in national arenas.

In a review of the literature surrounding the debates, conventions, and writings of this period, three themes stand out:

1. The tradition of the normal school with its insistence on professionalized subject matter. This has been the watchword of the skilled practitioner; he holds the translation of subject matter and its theory to be the task of the master teacher, with the prospective teacher as working apprentice.

2. The tradition of the graduate school with its allegiance to the German model of graduate education and research. This graduate school,

with its interpenetration of staff and offerings with the liberal arts and sciences of the undergraduate departments, is indeed the ritualistic, honorific, as well as the actual keeper of the tradition of the modern university.[4]

3. The Jacksonian tradition of elevation and leveling rather than elimination or stratification in institutions of teacher education. Actually, colleges and universities have been encouraged to do as well as they can under the circumstances (the role of the market is dominant). Implementation of any standards of performance, such as the Flexner report and its relationship to standards in medical schools, has been frowned on in official and public documents.

It is not surprising, then, that evolving compromises and accommodations in teacher education have dominated the sociopsychological context of change and reform. In summary, it is not out of place here to indicate that the central tendencies in teacher education over the last fifty years have been three; its responsiveness to the public demand for more schooling; its ready acceptance of the sons and daughters of working class families; and its viable response to emerging patterns of national, state, and local politics.[5]

Much of the mythology surrounding teaching, schooling, and the educative process is born because practitioners in the field need protection from the incursions of researchers and others who would look at the system and its results in a more or less objective fashion.[6] Consequently, we are ever faced with some propositions to which practitioners and the general public pay homage. To cite but a few: The system of education is local in nature with controls at the local community level.

Class size is critical to the learning process. Teachers are independent professionals providing a professional service in the classroom. Teaching can never be measured because we can never agree on basic terms. These and other mythologies cause immense difficulties when one attempts to look at the manner in which professionals can be prepared and at the critical entry points in the system.

The System of Education

In considering the nature of the educational system, some writers[7] have concluded that we have, de facto, a national system of education. The evidence which one can muster for this conclusion centers on four basic, though indirect, assessments:

1. There exists a national recruitment of teachers.
2. Students move from school system to school system with little difficulty.
3. Instructional materials enjoy a national market.
4. There is, in effect, a national examination system.[8]

At the start of our analysis we see a loose confederation of 37,025 school districts with little difference between them in organization, teaching, curriculum, or means of separation and promotion. The existence of a large scale organization, serviced by supporting and ancillary systems,[9] indicates that the prospect of local attempts at innovation and change will suffer at the hands of a superbly functioning, interlocking series of schools, the top of which is the graduate department of the modern university.

This last point is critical, for an examination of the school system shows a basically hierarchical structure, with great power, in-

fluence, and decision-making at the top. The selectivity, recruitment, and efficiency which are built into any bureaucratic structure are part of the system of education, wherein the interests of the higher group are serviced by those immediately below. Educators in public schools have had training in the college, often in the graduate department of a university. The interpenetration of staff, function, and especially control over entrance to the graduate departments of a university, creates a self-contained and self-perpetuating system, supported in turn by a series of ancillary structures.

In this brief analysis we view the school system as clearly bureaucratic in the same sense as bureaucracy was defined by Max Weber in 1922. Specialization of function, limited role definition, and an interdependence of various substructures characterize the system of schooling in the United States. Additionally, one factor which simultaneously causes a difficulty and gives a direction should be noted. The enormous turnover of teachers[10] increases the regularity and the rigidity of curriculum, procedures, and induction techniques; moreover, it forces a certain stability.

Now, because innovation and change require attention, follow-through, and a "product champion,"[11] an indication of one possible direction for teacher education emerges. Given the tentative nature of commitment on the part of the functionaries at the lower level (e.g., teachers), any developmental procedures should look to the committed professions in the school system, especially those with supervisory, administrative, or regulatory duties.

The above point is reinforced by the nature of the reward system in the teaching profession. Generally speaking, the teacher tends to look to the principal and to his immediate supervisors for support, encouragement, and reward. Much of the evidence which centers on this critical point indicates that the principal of a building is a critical person in setting the climate in which teachers function. The evidence further indicates that teachers respond to this climate. A climate which is permissive from the top down translates itself into a similar kind of classroom organization.

Moreover, the large city school systems seem to develop a sense of climate which is unique to each city.[12] Boston sets forth one kind of organizational climate based on a unique history and tradition, while New York entertains another. A recent study of the New York system[13] (and there is substantial evidence to adduce that this evidence is not unique to New York City) indicated the enormous power wielded by the "corps of supervisory employees at the headquarters building." The crucial nature of the power here was in the area of budget and curriculum, but included other areas of school operation as well.

Obviously, such a study reinforces the point that school systems tend to generate their own bureaucracy, to limit the nature and rate of change within the system, to function with their ancillary structures in a national system of education, and to create a uniformity of response so as to protect those within the system from those without.

Consider what we have, then, in this system of education:

1. A de facto national system of education which is geared to several functions, supported by a formal system as well as complementary

and independent ancillary structures related to testing, accreditation, and promotion to higher levels;

2. An interlock between each level of education, with the graduate school as the capstone of the system;[14]

3. A bureaucratic system in which role definition and specialization of purpose tend to place the teacher in the role of functionary rather than autonomous professional;

4. A hierarchical system with much power above the level of teaching, but centered on the middle level functionaries.

Emerging from this consideration of the system of education in the United States is the realization that teacher education, like the system of public schools, has an enormous capacity to absorb change and not change at all. The capacity of the system to adopt, modify, accommodate to, and regularize hundreds of program changes indicates the enormous political power which this informal system can exert. It takes virtually anyone into camp and has, consequently, more camp followers than troops. The endless arguments of teacher educators as to the reliability of one program as opposed to another has been so much psychological fluff. Indeed, a review of programs related to the preparation of teachers indicates that the apparent philosophical differences between one program or another are but shadows in the illusory series of debates held at conventions and in classrooms. There is a benefit to the system in these discussions, however; if someone does raise the question of what has been going on in the field, the teacher educator who is on his toes can point with pride to the unique program at Oskhosh--just exactly what the critic wishes to see. When the teacher education program of the nation is everything, it quickly becomes nothing.

The one real difference within the field of teacher education relates to the controversy whether all of the subject matter in the liberal arts, all of the professional courses, and all of the experiences in practice teaching, should be related to the single function of teacher education. This basic and fundamental difference was quickly resolved by the desires of professional educationists for a regular place in the college-university structure, by the ambitions of prospective teachers for courses which would lend themselves to convertability in furthering careers other than teaching, by the expansiveness of the modern university, and by state legislatures seeing little profit in maintaining separate undergraduate institutions presenting, apparently, the same subject matter offerings. Too, the historically viable, intellectual claim of the liberal arts in teacher education was not and could not be denied.

A seemingly analogous kind of development went on in the field of vocational education. In reality, however, the context of training and subject matter for the trades and industrial complex was explicitly different from the typical undergraduate program, while the evolving single-purpose normal school could make no such claim.

For all these reasons, then, the modern university, with its research orientation and domination by graduate school, found a place for the preparation of teachers, administrators, and other related personnel. Together with the former normal schools (turned state colleges), the modern university, including the schools and colleges of education, continues to have the broadest possible conception of its role. This pervasive effort and interest is both a tribute to those

involved in the effort and a caution for those who enter the lists of teacher education.

A Venture into Organizational Systems

Working with the proposition that the educational system is hierarchical in nature, and that it corresponds to a highly organized bureaucratic structure, it becomes important to examine some of the general principles of organizational change that have evolved in recent years. There is no reason at this time to suppose that the educational system is any different from other systems nor that the relative difficulty of effecting change is any less.

One underlying principle is that organizational change occurs infrequently. However, as some writers have noted,[15] change sometimes does occur within organizational structures and from these limited number of occurrences some tentative generalizations are possible. Some of these generalizations refer to the nature of change vis-à-vis participants in the system, while others refer to the changes that may be expected within the administrative structure of an organization.

Initially, it might be well to spell out some sociopsychological principles which seem to operate when organizational change does occur. First, expectations of individuals within an organizational pattern are absolutely critical to the accomplishment of change. Since unilateral power and the notion of hierarchical ordering underlie the educational system, the expectations of the person directly above the teacher are far more important in creating change in the teacher than those below him, i.e., his students. The same principle holds as, moving up the organizational ladder, one reaches the graduate school.

Second, change off the job has far less force than changes which occur *in situ*. When the individual is out of his own organizational situation, for example, attending summer programs in college classes, Saturday morning programs or evening lectures, the changes that occur at those times do not have any long-term impact when the individual returns to the organizational setting.

Third, an intimate relationship exists between conditions which facilitate change and the personality structure of teachers or administrators who are willing to accept the change. This syndrome, which includes both personal characteristics on the part of the school functionary and educational programs developed within the school, is crucial to the odds for or against change. Neither the quality nor the rate of educational change is improved by going to school personnel or situations wherein lies resistance to educational innovation.

Fourth, the improvement of school functionaries by arrangement in a vertical pattern of training proves more feasible than a horizontal arrangement. This is to say that including school personnel drawn from the lowest echelons (teacher aides) to the highest (superintendents) in a single training arrangement is preferable to including all members of a single horizontal echelon in such an arrangement. Similarly, linking college personnel with public school personnel proves more efficacious than keeping them separate.

Fifth, programs of change involving segments of the educational systems must have continuing feedback to controlling forces above. Without these, educational organizations tend to stress cost reduction, which, in turn, often influences the change process. Programs involving

teachers, administrators, or related educational personnel must set up in advance an adequate system of information feedback and evaluation.

Sixth, the changes contemplated by an educational system or by those outside the system must be capable of institutionalization. That the innovation or change can become part of the school system ought to be the objective of any group wishing to introduce such change. Essentially, the idea to be introduced cannot be so different from present practices that it will be a puzzle or a threat to practitioners or functionaries.

Seventh, and last, what seems to come through the haze surrounding the issues of an educational and organizational bureaucracy is that if change is to occur and become a part of the organizational bureaucracy itself, then something more than ideology must come into play--someone has to be in charge.

Besides these general principles of organizational and bureaucratic change, let us consider what Griffith[17] has written about the nature of administrative change. He lists four principles relative to conditions that aid educational change:

1. The major impetus for change in organizations is from the outside.

2. The degree and duration of the change is directly proportional to the intensity of the stimulus from the supra-system (outside).

3. Change in an organization is more probable if the successor to the administrator is from outside the organization than if he is from inside the organization.

4. Systems respond to continuously increasing stress, first by a lag in response, then by an over-compensatory response, and finally by catastrophic collapse of the system.

Additionally, Griffith notes that organizations have four characteristics which inhibit educational change:

1. The number of innovations is inversely proportional to the tenure of the chief administrator.

2. The more hierarchical the structure of the organization, the less the possibility of change.

3. When change in an organization does occur, it will occur from the top down, not from the bottom up.

4. The more functional the dynamic interplay of subsystems, the less change there will be in an organization.

Applying the sociopsychological dimension of the matter in combination with the administrative theory as postulated by Griffith, the conclusion appears to be that innovation from the bottom is virtually impossible, and that the independence of subsystems within the organization isolates each group from change activity.

Clearly, then, the challenges that we face in organizational and bureaucratic change in education are (a) the linking of functionaries, (b) the provision for communication between those at the top and at the bottom, (c) the engaging in programmatic activities which are centered in the situation where the functionaries are at work, and (d) the selection of school systems and individuals who seem to have a propensity for testing out new ideas.

At the same time, and especially in the light of the foregoing discussion, any consideration of power in teacher education must include a reference to the context of higher education in which teacher education finds itself. If one wishes to assess the possibilities and potential-

ities of funding experimental programs in teacher education, the critical questions must involve the students as potential, the college as unique, and the program as organic both for students and for college. Large scale intrusions into training programs, therefore, cannot be based on a single model but must rather turn to the advantages which colleges in individual contexts seem to offer. One resource is the growing body of material which strives to review and locate critical linch-pins in the bureaucratic structure of schools and colleges. Those responsible for the assessment of power in schools and colleges must maintain the tendency to partialize the problems of schools and colleges, for the very size of the educational establishment has provided a convenient haze and smog with which those who wish to,may parry and obfuscate responsible criticism of the establishment.

The Gulf Between Higher and Lower Education

In order now is a review of the three major factors which tend to increase the gulf between colleges and professors on the one hand, and schools and teachers on the other. Although this list is not exhaustive, given the connections between higher education, teacher education, and the public schools, it seems that these factors are the most critical.

1. The decline of teaching in colleges and universities

This major factor in beginning, maintaining, and extending such a breach has resulted in the diminishing of the status of teaching while simultaneously raising the prestige of research. The universities, historically, were provided with an accounting system for each professor which had little substantial relationship to his value as a teacher.

If teacher education had not become such a part of the developing expansiveness of the university, we might not be in great difficulty, but since the sine qua non of any professional training now is the close linkage of the program of training to the field of practice and the improvement of that practice by research and theory, the decline of teaching in higher education increases the skepticism of the practitioner. The subordination of teaching by professors, together with inclusion of teacher education in the university, presented both the prospective teacher and the developing university with a paradox and an anomaly. As a result, those responsible for the education of teachers seemed to be characterized as either non-teachers or teachers by default.

2. The growth of organization, bureaucracy, and power

The inevitability of large-scale organization in most aspects of national life[19] does not make it any less important as a factor to be considered. In a very real sense the politics of change in education center about the relative impact of organizational and bureaucratic forms. The rationalization and professionalization of the education establishment has had its momentary advantages: e.g., the accommodation of large numbers in teacher education and schooling, the efficiency of response to unique requirements such as publications and communications, the multiplicity of program development, larger service staff, and the like. At the same time, it has resulted in a number of developments which could seriously affect teacher education: e.g., lack of attention to individual differences, bureaucratization of response to criticism. Again, hours of preparation and credits for graduation seem to have become more important than the substance of the experience.

One of the factors which seem to distinguish higher education from most public school institutions is that in a fairly large number of colleges and universities, power is genuinely vested in the faculty rather than in the administration.[20] Curriculum, changes within that curriculum, addition of new staff, program development, expansion, and other such matters of internal organization are, in effect, voted in or out (mostly in, one might add) by the faculty. The role of gatekeeper is carefully preserved, and programs for the preparation of practitioners for the professions, business, graduate school and the like, are guarded jealously. However, the illusory quality of all higher education as a single corporate structure must be emphasized. While many elements of higher education seem to be the same, actually diversity of talent, program, and tradition is the rule of the establishment.

The research effort[21] in the study of higher education needs further explication, but at this time some hypotheses can be drawn with respect to the organizations and personnel engaged in the process. Study after study in higher education (the context for much of teacher education) shows that the climate of intellect, the freedom and the quality of faculty and students, the domination or lack of domination by administrative officers, and the impact of the college and its program on personality and thought, vary greatly from one campus to another. The kind of student, the kind of college or university, the kind of faculty, and the kind of training program create individual, local, and almost endless combinations, permutations, and possibilities. And so it must be with a multi-faceted and multivariate approach that one approaches the issue of teacher education in the realm of higher education.

3. The democratic leveling movement in teacher education

The dominant tendency in accreditation of teacher education has been to allow each college, given the local conditions which obtain, to develop to its optimum. This open and generous internal policy in teacher education has not well served the movement toward quality of such education. Nor has it served the movement of quality in higher education, for the history of legally or de facto segregated, ghetto-type colleges is a blunt reminder that things will go on as before unless there is a massive push for quality from the outside.

The ghetto of teacher education is not in any different position--actually it could be in a more difficult position relative to its improvement. Excellent teacher education must have as an integral part of its program an excellent liberal arts faculty. Consequently, the improvement of the education of teachers is one with the improvement of the higher education establishment. Except in some odd manner which equates pieces of paper, the issuance of a teaching certificate by the best institution and the worst institution does not cover up the fact that the prospective teacher is very different by virtue of having attended the best or the worst.

The intellectual price one pays for a system of de facto unequal higher education is unequally prepared teachers who perpetuate poor education. The relatively easy solution of everyone's doing "better" is no solution for the difficulties of the educational establishment. What is manifestly clear is that future funding of teacher education must not follow the easy path of gradual upgrading, but must bet on the fastest running horses.

Conditions Favoring Change

It is hoped that previous discussion of change may enable one to view the process of change from a standpoint more rational than hortatory; likewise, it may guide some intelligent funding of developmental programs in teacher education. Through the blur of organizational and extralegal power relationships (AACTE, AOTE, NCATE, state voluntary associations, TEPS, and the like) some hypotheses as to the conditions favoring change in bureaucratic structures can be postulated. Several writers[22] have begun to examine questions, problems, and obstacles to the creation of such an open system of organization and to the effective functioning of powerful agencies and groups. The findings offer some degree of validity and reliability, but the issue that seems to orient most of the material is its reliance on a sociopsychological conception of persons, personal relationships, and procedures within organizational structures.

A summarization[23] of these sociopsychological premises would include the following:

1. Program development which emphasizes actual questions, problems, and difficulties facing the teacher and the teacher educator will have a greater chance for success than one replete with hidden agendas and concerns for obscure problems more imagined than real.
2. The active involvement of all parties in the institutions is essential if program development is to occur.
3. Feedback to those who are funding the program and to relevant connecting institutions (for education: public schools, state departments of education, campus departments of education, administration, liberal arts) is essential if the continuous development of the program is to move forward.

4. The problem of teacher education always should be partialized so that the immensity of the program does not overwhelm those involved in change.

5. Wherever possible, evaluation procedures should be constructed to provide valid and reliable measures relative to the kinds of changes the program is attempting to accomplish.

Directions and Priorities

It is possible to review the matter of educational system and its attendant problems, explicate the research on organizational and bureaucratic change, look to some examples of this change within large-scale organizations in the society, and then quit. The task of the "here and now" requires that two questions be reviewed and kept in mind. First, there must be some attention to the direction of professional training and to its component parts; second, there must be attention to the issue of priority in servicing the educational system with a view related to professional development. Let us go to the first question.

The professional in the education system has a unique function in that he spends a working life serving the welfare of others in a more or less direct fashion. This service results from his clients' perception of the service as necessary. The professional in the field of education, therefore, should have one of the specific characteristics of the helping professions--that of two-way communication with the client. In the educational transaction the client (the student) responds not in terms of something that is done to him, but in terms of what the experiences in school mean to him.[24]

The development of the professional teacher and administrator, both service functionaries, begins, ends, and is passed on to the degree in which they feel an assuredness and security about the tasks they are expected to perform. The question of analyzing the tasks which the professional educator is expected to perform is twofold: What should the educational enterprise be about? and, How can the translation of specific knowledge and skills on the part of teachers and administrators be effected so as to cause a school system to operate with the above goals in mind? A consideration of these two elements will bring us full circle in our analysis.

If schools are meant (using Melvin Tumin's language) for children--for their development, their growth, and their pleasure, and if this same development of children takes place in transactions between the student and the teacher, then it follows that when children fail to develop to their optimum, the shortcomings or errors are to be sought in the structure of the school system, not in the innards of the children.[25]

If one extends the above proposition to consider that a child takes from schooling what is inherently valuable to him; if one adds that there is no conceivable justification for a democratic society's preferring the education of some children over others, then it surely does follow that every child has a full claim on the facilities and rewards of the school.

The consequences of such a series of simple propositions related to the educational development of children would mean that the professional's knowledge, skill, and attitudes with respect to schooling (learning, and teaching) would mean something other than what appears to be the present

bureaucratic stance. What is being postulated at this point is that the teacher's knowledge and his capacity to use that knowledge in a professional setting is not well served by the present hierarchical structure of the educational system nor by the narrow range of subject matter which many teachers study in that system.

Optimally, the direction of professional development of both teachers and administrators could center on the basic proposition of the inherent worth of individual differences, not their denigration or elimination. The flexible use of teachers, supervisory and administrative skills, the full development of individual potential, and the classroom setting as diagnostic rather than bureaucratic, are but some of the goals which could be pursued by teachers, supervisors, and administrators.

Let me give an example. The teacher who has received the standard undergraduate curriculum views his assuredness, his teaching, and his role in the school system as that of a middle-level functionary operating to create skills in children which will enable them to be successful at the next highest level of specialization. Essentially, the teacher functions as a gatekeeper.

Reinforcing the teacher's concept of the classroom is the context in which he receives his advanced graduate instruction. In most cases an experienced teacher takes courses at a college or university. Such courses are defined by professors and approved by departments, both serving the same kind of gatekeeper function. The courses are organized in the time-honored fashion which comprises lectures, quizzes, and research papers. The teacher or administrator who comes to the course is presented with a view of knowledge which is increasingly specialized and in many cases

not at all relevant to his classroom situation. Knowledgeable professors and less knowledgeable students come together--one to give, the other to receive; both assume that what the university offers will improve the teacher and his teaching. The reality is, probably, that the teachers and administrators have conformed to the higher forms of gatekeeping, while the critical issues of learning, teaching, and related problems have rarely surfaced. By setting the education of teachers and administrators in the structure of college and university course rather than in the situation where teachers and administrators find their work, evidence previously cited is contradicted. Moreover, the linkage between the system of public education and the system of higher education is not readily apparent, except on the terms of the latter.

In summary, let me suggest that if schools are to be related to the educational development of children and if the schools are to serve other than a gatekeeper or bureaucratic function, then the education of professionals will require a different conceptualization from that which we presently find.

Principles Which Could Help

We have attempted to review first, the basic nature of the educational system and its attendant bureaucratic problems; second, the nature of organizational change in both a general and administrative fashion; third, the goals of the system we call education; and fourth, the goals of professional training as related to the goals of that system. Clearly, professional preparation appears to lack any relevance to many of the pressing problems of schools, classrooms, and children. What

is also clear is that much of undergraduate and graduate study is linked to the needs of the bureaucracy above, not to the schools below.

Consequently, the guidelines which are suggested as a concluding statement to this paper are based upon the previous discussion as well as an interpretation of the research findings in relationship to the broader possibilities of all educational personnel training. These suggestions should be regarded as tentative, subject to review, and serviceable as a basis for further discussion.

1. Priority should be given to those programs which design a closer meshing of university and school personnel in situ. The situational context of professional development should be the context in which professionals work. Therefore--

There should be a priority for those school districts indicating a willingness to cooperate with college and university staff, and vice-versa.

There should be a continuing feedback arrangement which involves a research component in each program.

Where feasible, a priority should be given to the concept of field test or practicum as crucial for all professionals in developing programs. Administrators and teachers must have the opportunity to try out and evaluate new ideas and programs.

The program should emphasize diversity of attack and receptivity to research findings for a considerable period of time.

2. Emphasis should be placed on the education and re-education of administrators, supervisors, and long-term professionals who are in control of school systems. Such education and re-education should be developed

between the professionals in the field and the professors at the university.

3. Priority should be given to program development which looks to vertical contexts in professional development, i.e., programs that include school functionaries ranging from teacher aides on the one hand to school superintendents on the other; from the beginning of professional development in the preservice arena to the in-service education of teachers and administrators including the cooperation of college and university staff as planning and training agents.

4. A priority should be given to a diagnosis of school difficulties, both teaching and administrative, as the beginning point of courses. Field experiences for professional development should be viewed as mandatory.

In the judgment of the writer we are long overdue for a critical re-education of the professional staff of school systems and of the total university personnel who must teach them. This paper proposes that any discussion of programmatic development in professional preparation and training must show a direction which will provide school and university personnel with greater vision and more insight into the system they control.

NOTES

1. Borrowman, Merle, editor. Teacher Education in America: A Documentary History. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965. Professor Borrowman has edited this work and has extensive notations with an excellent introduction.

2. Stinnett, T. V., "Teacher Certification." Review of Educational Research. American Educational Research Association 37:3; June 1967.

3. Borrowman, Merle. op. cit., pp. 1-53.

4. Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Vintage Books, 1962. Pp. 329-354 and pp. 395-416.

5. Hodenfield, G. K., and Stinnett, T. M. The Education of Teachers: Conflict and Consensus. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961. Chapters 1-4. This work is still one of the best summaries of the various arguments and debates that go on in teacher education. The flexibility of teacher education came in for some criticism with the publication of James Conant's The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.) The response of teacher educators to some of the more pressing national issues--reflected in concern for certification, the interest of the federal government, and the more concerted demands for "upgrading" from a public which saw education as relatively weak after the Sputnik affair--was critically examined by Conant and his associates.

6. Miles, Matthew, editor. Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

7. Wayland, Sloan R. "Structural Features of American Education as Basic Factors in Innovation." Innovation in Education. (Edited by Matthew Miles.) New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. Chapter 23.

8. Ibid., pp. 599-602.

9. Ibid., pp. 595-596.

10. The NEA Research Division reports that of all persons who are prepared to teach in any one year, no more than 2 out of 5 (40%) are actually teaching five years later.

11. Miles, Matthew., op. cit., Chapter 25. Miles, M. B., "Innovation in Education: Some Generalizations."

12. Alan Rosenthal, at Rutgers University, is completing a study of several large city school systems which is instructive on this point.

13. Gittell, Marilyn. Participants and Participation: A Study of School Policy in New York City. New York: The Center for Urban Education, 1967.

14. Wayland, Sloan R., op. cit., pp. 594-595.

15. Daniel E. Griffiths. "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations." Innovation in Education. (Edited by Matthew B. Miles.) New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. Chapter 18, pp. 425-436.

16. Miles, Matthew., op. cit. See also Floyd C. Mann, "Styling and Creating Change" in Bennis, Warren G.; Benne, Kenneth D.; and Chin, Robert. The Planning of Change, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961. Pp. 612-613.

17. Griffiths, op. cit., p. 434.

18. Rudolph, op. cit., Chapter 19.

19. March, James G., and Simon, Herbert, in collaboration with Guetzkow, Harold. Organizations, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958. Passim. See also Crozier, Michel. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

20. Rudolph, op. cit., passim.

21. Wilson, Thomas P. Colleges and Student Values: An Overview of Educational and Research Concerns. New York: Carnegie Foundation, 1964.

22. Bennis, Warren G.; and others, op. cit., passim.

23. I have detailed a listing and explication of these issues in "Who Wins the Game: Successful Programs for the Disadvantaged." The Metropolitan School System and the University: A Pattern for Partnership.(Edited by Herbert C. Rudman.) Lansing: Michigan State University, 1966. See also Miles, op. cit., Chapter 25.

24. Smith, C. E. Educational Research and the Preparation of Teachers. British Columbia Teachers Federation, 1963. Pp. 62-63.

25. Tumin, Melvin. "Teaching in America." (Speech delivered to National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, Fifth Annual Conference, Washington, D. C.)